

inconvenience as they best may, but they have not made it an art to repel it; it is not worth their while; the science of calefaction and ventilation is reserved for the north. It is in this way that Catholics stand relatively to Protestants in the science of education; Protestants are obliged to depend on human means solely, and they are, therefore, led to make the most of them; it is their sole resource to use what they have; "knowledge is" their "power" and nothing else; they are the anxious cultivators of a rugged soil. It is otherwise with us; *funos ceciderunt mihi in proclario.* We have a goodly inheritance. The Almighty Father takes care of us; He has promised to do so; His word cannot fail, and we have continual experience of its fulfillment. This is apt to make us, I will not say, rely too much on prayer, on the Divine word and blessing, for we cannot pray too much or expect too much from our great Lord; but we sometimes forget that we shall please Him best, and get most from Him, when we use what we have in nature to the utmost, at the same time that we look out for what is beyond nature in the confidence of Faith and hope. However, we are sometimes tempted to let things take their course, as if they would in one way or another turn up right at last for certain; and so we go on, getting into difficulties and getting out of them, succeeding certainly on the whole, but with failures in detail which might be avoided, and with much of imperfection or inferiority in our appointments and plans, and much disappointment, discouragement, and collision of opinion in consequence. We leave God to fight our battles, and so He does; but He corrects us while He prospers us. We cultivate the innocence of the dove more than the wisdom of the serpent; and we exclaim our Lord's word and in our rebuke, when He declared that "the children of this world were in their generation wiser than the children of light."

It is far from impossible, then, at first sight, that on the subject before us. Protestants may have discerned the true line of action and estimated its importance aright. It is possible that they have investigated and ascertained the main principles, the necessary conditions of education, better than some among ourselves. It is possible at first sight, and it is probable in the particular case, when we consider, on the one hand, the various and opposite positions which they occupy relatively to each other; yet, on the other, the uniformity of the conclusions to which they arrive. The Protestant communions, I need hardly say, are respectively at a greater and a less distance from the Catholic Church, with more or with less of Catholic doctrine and of Catholic principle in them. Supposing, then, it should turn out, on a survey of their opinions and their policy, that in proportion as they approach, in the genius of their religion, to Catholicism, so do they become clear in their enunciation of a certain principle in education, that very circumstance would be an argument, as far as it went, for concluding that in Catholicism itself the recognition of that principle would, in its seats of education, be distinct and absolute. Now, I conceive that this remark applies in the controversy to which I am addressing myself. I must anticipate the course of future remarks so far as to say what you have doubtless, gentlemen, yourselves anticipated before I say it, that the main principle on which I shall have to proceed is this—that education must not be disjointed from religion, or that mixed schools, as they are called, in which teachers and scholars are of different religious creeds, none of which, of course, enter into the matter of instruction, are constructed on a false idea. Here, then, I conceive I am right in saying that every sect of Protestants, which has retained the idea of religious truth and the necessity of Faith, which has any dogma to profess and any dogma to lose, makes that dogma the basis of its education, secular as well as religious, and is jealous of those attempts to establish schools of a purely secular character, which the inconvenience of religious differences urges upon politicians of the day. This circumstance is of so striking a nature as in itself to justify me, as I consider, in my proposed appeal in this controversy to arguments and testimony short of Catholic.

Now, gentlemen, let me be clearly understood here. I know quite well that there are multitudes of Protestants who are advocates for mixed education to the fullest extent, even so far as to desire the introduction of Catholics themselves into their colleges and schools; but, then, first, they are those for the most part who have no creed or dogma whatever to defend, to sacrifice, to surrender, to compromise, to hold back, or to "mix," when they call out for mixed education. There are many Protestants of benevolent tempers and business-like minds, who think that all who are called Christians do not in fact agree together in essentials, though they will not allow it; and who, in consequence, call on all parties in educating their youth for the world to eliminate differences, which are certainly prejudicial, as soon as they are proved to be immaterial. It is not surprising that clear-sighted persons should fight against the maintenance and imposition of private judgment in matters of public concern. It is not surprising that statesmen, with a thousand conflicting claims and interests to satisfy, should fondly aim at a forfeited privilege of Catholic times, when they would have had at least, one distraction the less in the simplicity of national education. And next, I can conceive the most consistent men, and the most zealously attached to their own system of doctrine, nevertheless consenting to schemes of education from which religion is altogether or almost excluded; from the stress of necessity, or the recommendations of expedience. Necessity has no law, and expedience is often one form of necessity. It is no principle with sensible men, of whatever cast of opinion, to do always what is abstractedly best. Where no direct duty forbids we may be obliged to do, as being best under circumstances, what we murmur and rise against, while we do it. We see that to attempt more is to effect less; that we must ac-

cept so much, or gain nothing; and so perforce we reconcile ourselves to what we would have far otherwise, if we could. Thus a system of mixed education may, in a particular place or time, be the least of evils; it may be of long standing; it may be dangerous to meddle with; it may be professedly a temporary arrangement; it may be in an improving state; its disadvantages may be neutralised by the persons by whom, or the provisions under which, it is administered.

Protestants then, in matter of fact, are found to be both advocates and promoters of mixed education; but this, as I think will appear on inquiry, only under the conditions I have set down, first, where they have no special attachment to the dogmas which are compromised in the comprehension; and next, when they find it impossible, much as they may desire it, to carry out their attachment to them in practice, without prejudicial consequences greater than those which that comprehension involves. Men who profess a religion, if left to themselves, make religious and secular education one. Where, for instance, shall we find greater diversity of opinion, greater acrimony of mutual opposition, than between the two parties, High Church and Low, which mainly constitute the Established religion of England and Ireland? Yet those parties, differing, as they do, from each other in other points, are equally opposed to the efforts of politicians to fuse their respective systems of education with those either of Catholics or of sectaries; and it is only the strong expedience of concord and the will of the state which reconcile them to the necessity of a fusion with each other. Again, we all know into what persuasions the English constituency is divided—more, indeed, than it is easy to enumerate; yet, since the great majority of that constituency, amid its differences, and in its several professions, distinctly dogmatise, whether it be Anglican, Wesleyan, Calvinistic, or so-called Evangelical (as is distinctly shown, if in no other way, by its violence against Catholics,) the consequence is, that, in spite of serious political obstacles and of the reluctance of statesmen, it has up to this time been resolute and successful in preventing the national separation of secular and religious education. This concurrence, then, in various instances, supposing it to exist, as I believe it does, of a dogmatic faith on the one hand, and an abhorrence of mixed education on the other, is a phenomenon which, though happening among Protestants, demands the attention of Catholics, over and above the argumentative basis, on which, in the instance of each particular sect, this abhorrence would be found to rest.

While, then, I conceive that certain Protestant bodies may, under circumstances decide, more successfully than Catholics, of a certain locality or period, a point of religious philosophy or policy, and may so far give us a lesson in perspicacity or prudence, without any prejudice to our claims to the exclusive possession of revealed truth. I say, they are in matter of fact likely to have done so in a case like the present, in which, amid all the variety of persuasions into which Protestantism necessarily splits, they agree together in a certain practical conclusion, which each of them in turn sees to be necessary for its own particular maintenance. Nor is there surely anything startling or novel in such an admission. The Church has ever appealed and deferred to testimonies and authorities external to herself, in those matters in which she thought they had means of forming a judgment; and that on the principle, *Critique in sua arte credendum.* She has ever used unbelievers and pagans in evidence of her truth, as far as their testimony went. She avails herself of heretical scholars, critics, and antiquarians. She has worded her theological teaching in the phraseology of Aristotle; Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotus, Origen, Eusebius, and Apollinaris, all, more or less heterodox, have supplied materials for primitive exegeses. St. Cyprian, called Tertullian his master; Bossuet, in modern times, complimented the labors of the Anglican Bull; the Benedictine editors of the Fathers are familiar with the labors of Fell, Ussher, Pearson, and Beveridge. Pope Benedict XIV., cites, according to the occasion, the works of Protestants without reserve; and the late French collection of Christian Apologists, contains the writings of Locke, Burnet, Tillotson, and Paley. If, then, I come forward in any degree as borrowing the views of certain Protestant schools on the point which is to be discussed, I do so, not, gentlemen, as supposing that even in philosophy the Catholic Church herself, as represented by her theologians or her schools, has anything to learn from men, or bodies of men, external to her pale; but as feeling, first, that she has ever, in the plenitude of her Divine illumination, made use of whatever truth or wisdom she has found in their teaching or their measures; and next, that in particular times or places, some of her children may probably profit from external suggestions or lessons which are in no sense necessary for herself.

And in thus speaking of human philosophy, I have intimated the mode in which I propose to handle my subject altogether. Observe, then, gentlemen, I have no intention of bringing into the argument the authority of the Church at all; but I shall consider the question simply on the grounds of human reason and human wisdom. And from this it follows that, viewing it as a matter of argument, judgment, propriety, and expedience, I am not called upon to deny that in particular cases a course has been before now advisable for Catholics in regard to the education of their youth, and has been, in fact, adopted, which was not abstractedly the best, and is no pattern and precedent for others. Thus, in the early ages, the Church sanctioned her children, frequenting the heathen schools for the acquisition of secular accomplishments, where, as no one can doubt, evils existed, at least as great as can attend on mixed education now. The gravest Fathers recommended for Christian youth the use of Pagan masters; the most

saintly Bishops and most authoritative Doctors had been sent in their adolescence by Christian parents to Pagan lecture halls.\* And, not to take other instances, at this very time, and in this very country, as regards at least the poorer classes of the community, whose secular acquirements ever must be limited, it has approved itself not only to Protestant state Ecclesiastics, who cannot be supposed to be very sensitive about doctrinal truth, but, as a wise concession, even to many of our most venerated Bishops, to suffer, under the circumstances, a system of mixed education in the schools called National.

On this part of the question, however, I have not to enter; for I confine myself to the subject of university education. But even here it would ill have become me to pretend, simply on my own judgment, to decide on a point so emphatically practical as regards a state of society, about which I have so much to learn, on any abstract principles, however true and important. It would have been presumptuous on me so to have acted, nor am I so acting. It is my happiness in a matter of Christian duty, about which the most saintly and the most able may differ, to be guided simply by the decision and recommendation of the Holy See—the judge and finisher of all controversies. That decision indeed, I repeat, shall not enter into my argument; but it is my own reason for arguing. I am trusting my own judgment on the subject, because I find it is the judgment of him who has upon his shoulder the government and the solicitude of all the Churches. I appear before you, gentlemen, not prior to the decision of Roms on the question of which I am to treat, but after it. My sole aspiration—and I cannot have a higher under the heavens—is to be the servant of the Vicar of Christ. He has sanctioned at this time a particular measure for his children who speak the English tongue, and the distinguished persons by whom it is to be carried out have honored me with a share in their work. I take things as I find them; I know nothing of the past; I find myself here; I set myself to the duties I find here; I set myself to further, by every means in my power, doctrines and views, true in themselves, recognised by all Catholics as such, familiar to my own mind; and to do this quite apart from the consideration of questions which have been determined without me and before me. I am here as the advocate and the minister of a certain great principle; yet not merely advocate and minister, else had I not been here at all. It has been my previous keen sense and hearty reception of that principle that has been at once the cause, as I must suppose, of my selection, and the ground of my acquiescence. I am told on authority that a principle is necessary, which I have ever felt to be true. As the royal matron in sacred history consigned the child she had made her own to the charge of its natural mother; so truths and duties which come of unaided reason, not of grace, which were already intimately mine by the workings of my own mind, and the philosophy of human schools, are now committed to my care, to nurse and to cherish by her and for her who, acting on the prerogative of her Divinely inspired discernment, has in this instance honored with a royal adoption the suggestion of reason.

Happy mother, who received her offspring back by giving him up, and gained, at another's word, what her own most jealous artifices had failed to secure at home! Gentlemen, I have not yet ended the explanations with which I must introduce myself to your notice. If I have been expressing a satisfaction that opinions early imbibed and long cherished in my own mind, now come to me with the Church's seal upon them, do not fancy that I am indulging a subtle kind of private judgment, especially unbecoming in a Catholic. It would, I think, be unjust to me, were any one to gather, from what I have been saying, that I had so established myself in my own ideas and in my old notions, as a centre of thought, that, instead of coming to the Church to be taught, I was but availing myself of such opportunities as she gave me to force principles on your attention which I had adopted without her. It would, indeed, be a most unworthy frame of mind, to view her sanction, however it could be got, as a sort of leave or permit, whereby the intellect obtains an outlet, which it is ever coveting, to range freely once in a way, and to enjoy itself in a welcome, because a rare holiday. Not so; human wisdom, at the very best, even in matters of religious policy, is principally but a homage, certainly no essential service to Divine Truth. Nor is the Church some stern mistress, practised only in refusal and prohibition, to be obeyed grudgingly and dexterously overreached; but a kind and watchful teacher and guide, encouraging us forward in the path of truth amid the perils which beset it. Deeply do I feel, ever will I protest, for I can appeal to the ample testimony of history to bear me out, that, in questions of right and wrong, there is nothing really strong in the whole world, nothing decisive and operative, but the voice of him, to whom have been committed the keys of the kingdom and the oversight of Christ's flock. That voice is now, as ever it has been, a real authority, infallible when it teaches, prosperous when it commands, ever taking the lead wisely and distinctly in its own province, adding certainty to what is probable, and persuasion to what is certain. Before it speaks, the most saintly may mistake; and after it has spoken, the most gifted must obey.

I have said this in explanation; but it has an application if you will let me to say, far beyond myself. Perhaps we have all need to be reminded, in one way or another, as regards our habitual view of things, if not our formal convictions, of the greatness of authority and the intensity of power, which accompany the decisions of the Holy See. I can fancy, gentlemen, among those who hear me there may be those who would be willing to acquit the principles

of education which I am to advocate of all fault whatever, except that of being impracticable. I can fancy them to grant to me, that those principles are most correct and most obvious, simply irresistible on paper, yet, after all, nothing more than the dreams of men who live out of the world, and who do not see the difficulty of keeping Catholicism anyhow afloat on the bosom of this wonderful nineteenth century. Proved, indeed, those principles are to demonstration, but they will not work. Nay, it was my own admission just now, that, in a particular instance, it might easily happen that what is only second best is best practically, because what is actually best is out of the question. This I hear you say to yourselves, is the state of things at present. You recount in detail the numberless impediments, great and small, threatening and vexatious, which at every step embarrass the attempt to carry out ever so poorly a principle in itself so true and Ecclesiastical. You appeal in your defence to wise and sagacious intellects, who are far from enemies, if not to Catholicism, at least to the Irish Hierarchy, and you simply despair, or rather you absolutely disbelieve, that education can possibly be conducted, here and now, on a theological principle, or that youths of different religions can, in matter of fact, be educated apart from each other. The more you think over the state of politics, the position of parties, the feelings of classes, and the experience of the past, the more chimerical does it seem to you to aim at anything beyond a university of mixed instruction. Nay, even if the attempt could accidentally succeed, would not the mischief exceed the benefits of it? How great the sacrifice, in how many ways, by which it would be preceded and followed?—How many wounds, open and secret, would it inflict upon the holy politic? And, if it fails, which is to be expected, then a double mischief will ensue from its recognition of evils which it has failed to remedy. These are your deep misgivings; and, in proportion to the force with which they come to you, is the concern and anxiety which they occasion you, that there should be those whom you love, whom you revere, who from one cause or other refuse to enter into them.

This, I repeat, is what some Catholics will say to me, and more than this. They will express themselves better than I can speak for them—with more nature and point, with more force of argument and fulness of detail, and I will frankly and at once acknowledge, gentlemen, that I do not mean here to give a direct answer to their objections. I do not say an answer cannot be given; on the contrary, I may have a confident expectation that, in proportion as those objections are locked in the face, they will fade away. But, however this may be, it would not become me to argue the matter with those who understand the circumstances of the problem so much better than myself. What do I know of the state of things in Ireland that I should presume to put ideas of mine—which could not be right except by accident—by the side of theirs, who speak in the country of their birth and their home? No, gentlemen, you are the natural judges of the difficulties which beset us, and they are doubtless greater than I can ever fancy or forbode. Let me, for the sake of argument, admit all you say against our enterprise, and a great deal more. Your proof of its intrinsic impossibility shall be to me as demonstrative as my own of its theological correctness. Why, then, should I be so rash and perverse as to involve myself in trouble not properly mine? Why go out of my own place? How is it that I do not know when I am well off? Why so headstrong and reckless as to lay up for myself miscarriage and disappointment, as though I had not enough of my own?

Considerations, such as these, would have been simply decisive in time past for the boldest and most able among us; now, however, I have one resting point—just one—one plea which serves me in the stead of all direct argument whatever, which hardens me against censure, which encourages me against fear, and to which I shall ever come round, when I hear the question of the practicable and the expedient brought into discussion. After all, Peter has spoken. Peter is no recluse, no abstracted student, no dreamer about the past, no doter upon the dead and gone, no projector of the visionary. Peter for 1800 years has lived in the world; he has seen all fortunes, he has encountered all adversities, he has shaped himself for all emergencies. If there ever was a power on earth who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable, and has been happy in his anticipations, whose words have been deeds, and whose command prophecies—such is he in the history of ages who sits on from generation to generation in the Chair of the Apostles, as the Vicar of Christ and Doctor of His Church.

Notions, then, taught me long ago by others, long cherished in my own mind; these are not my confidence. Their truth does not make them feasible, nor their reasonableness persuasive. Rather, I would meet the objector by an argument of his own sort. If you tell me this work will fail, I will make answer—the worker is apt to succeed, and I trust in my knowledge of the past more than in your prediction of the future. It was said by an old philosopher, who declined to reply to an emperor's arguments—"It is not safe controverting with the master of twenty legions." What Augustine had in the material order, that, and much more, has Peter in the spiritual. Peter has spoken by Pius, and when was Peter ever unequal to the occasion? When has he not risen with the crisis? What dangers have ever daunted him? What sophistry foiled him? What uncertainties misled him? When did ever any power go to war with Peter, material or moral, civilised or savage, and get the better? When did the whole world ever band together against him solitary, and not find him too many for them?

These are not the words of rhetoric, gentlemen, but of history. All who take part with Peter are

\* Vide, M. L'Abbe Lalanne's recent work.